



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

5

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,977	12/31/2001	Kristine B. Fuimaono	36773/KMO/W112	1747
23363	7590	11/10/2004	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP			MANUEL, GEORGE C	
PO BOX 7068			ART UNIT	
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068			PAPER NUMBER	

3762

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/040,977	Applicant(s) FUIMAONO ET AL.	
	Examiner George Manuel	Art Unit 3762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 24-27, 29, 31-35 and 39-43 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-23, 28, 30, 36-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-22, 28, 30 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGee et al '592 in view of Webster, Jr. '313.

McGee et al disclose an implantable electrode arrangement comprising a proximal end 26 and a distal end 24.

Webster, Jr. discloses a proximal end 8 and a distal tip 31 made of plastic. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to comprise tip 31 of a material which is non-conductive because most plastic materials are non-conductive. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to comprise the end 8 of a non-conductive material because the sheath 8 is intended to be passed through tissue which would be adversely affected by a conductive sheath.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to substitute the electrode structure of Webster, Jr. with that of McGee for creating an atrial defibrillation arrangement because the electrodes structures are of an equivalent size and shape for atrial defibrillation and because it is well known to substitute a sensing electrode for an active stimulation electrode.

Regarding claim 9, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to provide a distal tip electrode in the non-conductive tip 31 because hub 24 of McGee et al appears to provide for tissue stimulation with such a distal tip.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGee et al '592 in view of Webster, Jr. '313 and further in view of Ljungstroem '864.

McGee et al in view of Webster, Jr. show all of the claimed features except for a patch electrode.

Ljungstroem teaches using a patch electrode outside of the heart. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use a patch electrode with the device of McGee et al in view of Webster, Jr. because a patch electrode is easy to attach and provides for a large number of attachment locations. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 3762

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 24-27, 29, 31-35 and 39-43 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Manuel whose telephone number is (703) 308-2118.


George Manuel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3762

11/8/04